REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in the present application. Claims 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2. Claims 1-12 and 19-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 1-8, 13-25, 30 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by "Full Product Review Adobe LiveMotion" (Skyrme). Claims 9-12 and 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Skyrme. Claims 1, 7, 12 and 17 have been amended. Claims 6, 16, and 24-31 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 2 Rejections

Claims 19-24 have been rejected as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that it is unclear what is meant by the "the display device." Applicants respectfully disagree that the claim language is indefinite, and the display device comprises a device capable of rendering the timeline element. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claims 19-24.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections

Claims 1-12 and 19-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claims invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. With respect to claims 1-12, Applicants respectfully disagree, but have amended claim 1 to overcome the rejections. With respect to claims 19-24, Applicants respectfully disagree that that the display device of claims 19-24 is not a machine as described under 35 U.S.C. 101. A display is clearly a machine. Accordingly, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 1-12 and 19-24.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-8, 13-25, 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended contain features not taught or suggested by the cited prior art. Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of now cancelled claim 6. Namely, **receiving a change to the at least one property**

prior to creating the second compound key frame, the second compound key frame incorporating the change to the at least one property. In the rejection to claim 6, the Examiner stated that Skyrme taught such a feature in section 2, page 2 third paragraph. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion explicitly describes creating a second key frame prior to receiving a change to a property. This is completely different than receiving the property then creating a second compound key frame as taught by claim 1 as amended. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1.

Claims 2-5 and 7 are all dependent on independent claim 1, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above for independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claims 2-5 and 7.

Independent claim 8 includes features not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Specifically, claim 8 teaches **amending the attribute key frame responsive to the received value for the attribute.** The Examiner stated that **amending the attribute key frame responsive to the received value for the attribute** is taught by Skyrme at section 1, page 1, sixth paragraph lines 3-7. Applicants respectfully disagree. First, the cited portion makes no mention of an attribute key frame. Furthermore, there is similarly no discussion of amending an attribute key frame, but rather a description of how the object transform drop down menu is opened. Applicants respectfully submit that this is not the same as **amending the attribute key frame responsive to the received value for the attribute.** Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 8.

Claims 9-11 are all dependent on claim 8, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for independent claim 8 above. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 9-11.

Independent claim 12 as amended includes features neither taught or suggested by the prior art of record. In particular, independent claim 12 includes the feature of **receiving a selection signal indicative of the user interface selection device selecting a change to the at least one property prior to displaying the second compound key frame, the second compound key frame incorporating the change to the at least one property.** This feature is similar to the feature argued above with respect to independent claim 1, and is similarly not present in the Skyrme reference. Skyrme explicitly teaches displaying the compound key frame prior to receiving a selection signal indicative of a change to a property. This is

completely the opposite of what is described in claim 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 12.

Claims 13-15 and 17 are all dependent on claim 12, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for independent claim 12 above. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 13-15 and 17.

Independent claim 18 includes features neither taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Specifically, claim 18 includes the feature of **receiving a selection signal indicative a selection of a second time for the object, and displaying a second compound key frame at the second time on the timeline element**. The Examiner stated that Skyrme teaches such a feature at section 1, page 1, sixth paragraph lines 3-7. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion describes how an image can be dragged around, and if the object transform drop down menu is opened, tweens are automatically inserted between key frames. There is simply no description of **receiving a selection signal indicative of a selection of a second time for the object and displaying a second compound key frame at the second time on the timeline element**, as required by claim 18. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 18.

Claims 19-23 are all dependent on claim 18, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given for independent claim 18 above. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 19-23.

Date: October 31, 2006   /Michael W. Tieff/
                                                         Michael W. Tieff
                                                         Registration No. 57,845

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439